CONTINUOUS METHOD OF DENITRATING TOBACCO EXTRACTS

Draft U.S. Application PM 913

1. The Luxembourg application has been revised to conform to the requirements of United States practice. In addition, the information contained in the PME Research Labs 1978 Annual Microbiology Report by Dieter Schulthess and in the PME Process Development Final Report of Trial Nino 39 by Beth Krasna has been incorporated into the application. Finally, information conveyed during an August 1979 meeting with Krasna and Schulthess in Richmond is included in the application.

The draft should be reviewed for accuracy and completeness of the description of the process. Information concerning any additional pertinent limitations or modifications of the process steps should be provided. It is of particular importance that all information concerning preferred modes of operation be provided.

2. Claim 1 should be reviewed to verify that all parameters necessary for continuous operation of the process are included. The remaining claims are intended to cover the preferred embodiments of the process and should be reviewed to verify that each of the various preferred modes of operation is accurately covered by at least one of these claims.

3. In Table IV of the draft application the glucose levels for runs 9 and 10 were originally stated to be 2.4 and 0.8 g/l. It appears, however, that these values should be 24 and 8 respectively in view of the nitrate levels in the starting solution. The actual results should be ascertained. If in fact 2.4 and 0.8 are accurate, it appears necessary to clarify requirements of the process relative to the ratio of carbon atoms to nitrate molecules.

4. With reference to the aeration rate, it is noted that the Luxembourg application stated a lower limit of 0.8 l/l/min, whereas some of the data in the two reports considered suggests that aeration rates of 0.5 l/l/min are acceptable at less than maximum carbon levels. Further, during the August meeting, the 0.8 rate was said to be the lower limit based upon maximum carbon levels. The actual minimum suitable aeration rates should be clarified.

5. According to United States practice, it is advisable to include all pertinent data relating to a claimed invention. Therefore, the conditions and results of any other runs involving the claimed process should be provided. Further, any additional data concerning the present examples, particularly with reference to the results of these runs, should be provided.

2026523720

Source: https://www.industrydocuments.ucsf.edu/docs/tmyj0000

6. The names of the inventors of the claimed process are required. In this connection, please include the inventors' full names. The inventors' Post Office and residential addresses, including any county, province or the like, are also required. Finally, the inventors' country of citizenship must be specified.

20265231721

Source: https://www.industrydocuments.ucsf.edu/docs/tmyj0000